

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ರಾಂದೇವ್.—ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ವಿಧಾನಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯವಿಧಾನ ಮತ್ತು ನಡವಳಿಕೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ೧೫೪ರ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪ ಎತ್ತುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರಾಗಿದ್ದ ದೇವೇಂದ್ರಪ್ಪ ಘಾಳಪ್ಪನವರು ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲಿ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಾಗ ವಿಧಾನಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ವಾಡಿಕೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವರಿಂದ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿಸುತ್ತೀರಾ? ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನೋ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆ ವಿಷಯ ನಮಗೆ ಬೇಡ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ದೇವೇಂದ್ರಪ್ಪ ಘಾಳಪ್ಪನವರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿಸಿ.

MR. SPEAKER.—I am aware of the fact; but the matter has gone before the Court. Therefore I cannot allow a discussion on this matter. Now, Sri S. R. Bommai wishes to make a statement.

Statements by Shri S. R. Bommai and by the Chief Minister.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI (Hubli).—Following the expulsion of Smt. Indira Gandhi from the Lok Sabha and her imprisonment on the privilege issue an unprecedented and virulent wave of violence, arson, hooliganism destruction and looting of public and private property was let loose by some of the ruling Congress (I) Party Leaders and anti-social hirelings on the innocent and peace loving citizens of our State on 19th December 1978 and subsequent days resulting in wanton destruction of property and loss of innocent lives and the Police administration completely failed or refused to take preventive and protective steps to maintain law and order and protect the lives, property and honour of the people. The Janata Party Offices, its Members and well-wishers and their homes and Central Government installations and offices were singled out as special targets for attack. In some cases, even State Government property was not spared. In some areas, women were also molested. The general public was mercilessly attacked and their property destroyed. The State Transport movement was stopped at the instance of Government with a view to paralyse normal movement of the public.

This was no spontaneous people's 'upsurge' as is being claimed by some apologists of the Congress (I) Party and the State Government. For days before these incidents some of the Congress (I) Leaders in the State had been holding out threats of "blood flowing" and "mass upsurge" in the event of Smt. Gandhi being punished by the Lok Sabha. What actually happened after the expulsion and imprisonment of Smt. Gandhi was not political protest by any stretch of imagination but a pre-planned reign of terror by the anti-social elements organised and financed by some of the State Congress (I) leaders and allowed by the police.

As a matter of fact, the ordinary people *i.e.*, the workers, the peasants, the traders, the intelligentsia and the students pointedly

ignored the pompous Congress (I) calls for protest action and went about their normal business.

That there was total lawlessness in large parts of the State is amply documented by News Paper reports. The Governor is himself on record as having said that the anti-social elements had a gay time from 19th evening to 20th afternoon. A top Police Officer of Bangalore has said that the looting was to an extent of Rs. 20 Lakhs in Bangalore City alone and it is estimated the total loss caused throughout the State runs into crores.

The State Government and its authority were well aware of the course of action by Parliament against Smt. Gandhi when the Prime Minister moved a motion in Lok Sabha for imprisonment and expulsion of Smt. Gandhi. It was quite evident from declaration and preparation of Congress (I) leaders their design to create lawlessness and chaos to terrorise the public with the ulterior motive to give an impression of a sharp reaction to the action of Parliament. In spite of this, Government and its officials willfully refrained from taking any precautionary measure to meet the possible situation of law and order which they have been doing all along previously. I would like to remind that the thousands of Opposition Party workers were detained by Police on the eve of the visits of Smt. Gandhi and Sanjaya Gandhi during Emergency and thereafter. Further the most sinister aspect of these disturbances was the instructions to the police that they should not take action against the anti-social elements but only to watch and report. It is this game of immobilising the Police and mobilising the anti-social elements to terrorise the people in general and the political opponents in particular which marked out this government as fascist regime. By this act of bringing about a police-goonda gang-up for partisan ends, this Government has forfeited all democratic credentials, if it ever had any.

It is true that the Government belatedly took some steps to control the situation. This was not because of any democratic good sense or moral compunctions dawning upon it, but because of its panic that its own days were numbered as the collapse of the law and order had been fast reaching a point of no return. This was evidenced by the alert to the Army, the frantic assurance by six Minister of the State to the Governor that law and order would be maintained, the Chief Minister's air dash to Bangalore from Delhi and the State Government's own requisition to the Centre for rushing C.R.P. to help it maintain law and order.

The basic issue is that the State Government has proved its autocratic propensity to destroy the foundations of constitutional government by making use of the Police for partisan ends, by using

and shielding anti-social elements and not agreeing to order a judicial enquiry into such serious charges to independently establish its *bona fides* and above all by its resort to the totalitarian technique of the big lie to pass on the blame for its crimes on to the shoulder of others.

The Janata Party and its Government at the Centre which dismantled the authoritarian structure of the hated Emergency regime and restored the democratic rights, of which the present Chief Minister and his colleagues are also beneficiaries, do not grudge the right of peaceful protest to any Party. But, it cannot allow a Party masquerading under a democratic garb to destroy the democratic polity by converting the anti-social elements and the Police into the limbs of the ruling party. The Janatha Party will fight this tendency tooth and nail whenever and wherever it raises its ugly head no matter with what heady slogans regardless of the cost.

All constitutional avenues like the approach to the Governor and to the Chief Minister to set up a Judicial Enquiry and payment of compensation to the victims have borne no fruits and as in fact there is not even repentance but only self-righteousness on the part of the State Government and a shameless defence of the atrocities as 'people's upsurge', we have no alternative but to resort to this painful procedure of withholding our co-operation in the conduct of proceedings because of the obstinate attitude of this Government to the just and legitimate demands by us and the general public of the State. We are prepared to extend our co-operation only if the Government returns to the path of democratic norms and responsibility in conducting the affairs of the State and in token thereof, agrees to concede to our demands.

Therefore, under these compelling circumstances,

"We demand a Judicial Enquiry by a sitting Judge of the High Court into all aspects of the disturbances which occurred following the expulsion and imprisonment of Smt. Indira Gandhi including the acts of omission and commission of the State Police and the Administration and payment of adequate compensation to the victims".

Sir, I have refrained from giving the details of the sequences of events, and also narrating the instances. I must thank the Press for their faithful and fearless reporting the incidents during those critical days. I must also congratulate the public who have voiced their views through the Press and by way of memorandum to the Government demanding a judicial enquiry in this matter. There are number of instances wherein the Govt.

suo-motu appointed judicial enquiries taking into consideration the gravity of the situation and the incidents. We all hope that the Hon. Chief Minister who is a seasoned administrator, and is well aware of the canons of the public administration would agree for a judicial enquiry. He could have done this before the House was summoned. However, even after the summoning of the House we have been persistently making this demand. There are instances where judicial enquiries have been agreed and appointed by the Government. I may name such two instances. Firstly, in the year 1968, in Madhugiri incident, Government was pleased to appoint a judicial enquiry and secondly in Sandur Taluk Government was pleased to appoint judicial enquiry. Therefore, I am sure, the Hon. Chief Minister taking into consideration the demand made by us and the public, will justify by taking action to appoint such a Commission. The Hon. Chief Minister is not only responsible to his part, but more so to the people of the State, and so he will agree for the demand so that the people will revive the faith in him and in his fair administration.

I would also like to appeal to him not stand on prestige on this issue. I have heard him saying that he has got open mind. I have got confidence that he would consider this demand. He must have already given thought to this demand. With this, we hope that he will agree for our fair and just demand to have a judicial enquiry into the atrocities that have taken place on those three days and find out ways and means to pay compensation to the victims.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವಿ. ಕಕ್ಕಿಲಾಯ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಇದೇ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನನಗೂ ಕೂಡ ದಯಮಾಡಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ಮೊದಲೇ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ನೀಡಿದ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ ದಯಮಾಡಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವಿ. ಕಕ್ಕಿಲಾಯ.—ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾನೂ ಕೂಡ ಕಳೆದ ನಾಲ್ಕು ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಶಾಂತ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು ೧೦೦ ವಂಶಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿದ್ದೂ ಏನೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ದಯಮಾಡಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

2.30 PM

MR. SPEAKER.—Only the Hon. Chief Minister will reply. I am not allowing any other member.

SRI B.V. KAKKILAYA.—I want to be assured that I will get an opportunity to talk.

† SRI D.DEVARAJ URS (Chief Minister).—Sir, after three day's of wrangling, we are happy that the Opposition Leader has been good enough to come out with his statement. In the end, he was pleased to say that I was standing on formalities or prestige. I do not want to answer that charge because it is so self-evident as to who was standing on prestige. That question has been known to this House and through this House to the public, as to which of us was standing on prestige. Nevertheless, I must compliment the Leader of the Opposition who ultimately saw logic and who was good enough to follow the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of this House. What I was saying was, after the question hour, I had no objection for the Leader of the Opposition to make this statement. Now that he has made the statement, I do not want to elaborate on that point. In the statement of his, there are a series of allegations made against the Government—not only against the Government but also against the party to which I have the honour to belong and he has also made several charges that the police administration had been influenced by the Government and the party leaders not to act. It does not stop at that. He goes on to charge that the police and anti-social elements had a pre-planned reign of terror and that these anti-social elements were financed by some of the State Congress (I) leaders and allowed by the police. Now that he has made this charge, I do not want to enter into a wordy duel on this matter. I only wish to say that what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has stated is totally baseless. It is baseless because it is not true to say that the Police connived or allowed anti-social elements, by their inaction, to go on a rampage. It is baseless to say that the State Congress (I) leaders have financed these persons. That is also totally baseless.

Now, there are so many other charges that this Government is partisan and undemocratic and that the police were tools in the hands of the undemocratic Government, which is termed as fascist regime. It also says that the Congress (I) leaders had designs to create lawlessness and chaos to terrorise the public with the ulterior motive to give an impression of a sharp reaction to the action of parliament. And, there is another charge *viz.*, that the most sinister aspect of these disturbances was the instructions to the Police that they should not take action against the anti-social elements but only to watch and report. So, after going through this statement you will find that there is nothing left so far as this Government and this party is concerned and there is not a word of appreciation. He has also made the tall claim that the Janatha Party and its Government at the Centre which dismantled the authoritarian structure of the hated emergency regime and restored the democratic rights, of which the present Chief Minister and his colleagues are also beneficiaries, do

not grudge the right of peaceful protest to any party. Before offering my comments on this, I think I owe to the Leader of the Opposition and to his party here, as well as in the Centre, my profound thanks: because of their grace and because of their actions, I have been occupying this position along with my colleagues.

(Sri Michael Fernandez interrupted by saying: 'Sir, I wish to say)

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, I only request the hon. member to kindly bear with me. I request all the hon. member either on their side or on this side not to disturb me. I only request them, 'kindly do not interfere'

Sir, now the whole world has come to know how much democratic Janatha Party is. One classic instance of their democratic approach and the democratic right they chose to restore was in Karnataka itself. I must say it because you have been admonishing and repeating it, my dear Opposition Leader. One year back, in the year 1978 January, 3rd of January was the day fixed for holding Session of this Assembly. On 31st December 1977 this house was dissolved and the Ministry was dismissed. This is a classic instance of their democratic approach.

SRI A. LAXMI SAGAR.—Sir, This is another instance of

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I know, my hon. Friend Sri Lakshmi Sagar is an Advocate and he knows how to argue his cases in the Courts of Law and perhaps he has so much of practice in Courts but I would only beg of him to observe certain norms.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ.ಎಸ್. ಶಿವನಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಅವರು ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಹಳೇ ಕಥೆಯನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತೇ ಇದೆ.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—My whole trouble with the hon. Members of the Opposition is, when they talk or whenever they want to say anything, we have to listen to them patiently but whenever we wanted to say something, I request them to listen to us patiently. This is a simple democratic right. Therefore, kindly allow me to have my say.

Now these are the defenders and upholders of democracy and democratic rights. Why should the defenders and upholders of democracy and democratic rights not allow others the same right? That is my only request. I leave it at that. I gave this as an instance only because it is a classic instance when there were only hardly three days left for our meeting, the Assembly was dissolved and the Ministry was dismissed. That is the most democratic way of dealing with matters! I applaud their sense of democracy.

Now, before going into the merits of so many charges regarding the action or inaction or omission or commission and connivance and what not, I would like to give, in the first instance, what is the political situation we are in to-day. That will serve as a background to understand why things happened in a particular way, under what circumstances. I am just quoting from a Paper that has been circulated by the National Police Commission wherein they have very succinctly and specifically described the present atmosphere in the country. It is not merely in Karnataka but throughout India. The Commission, as you are aware, Sir, is meant to go round the country and to find solution. It is called - The National Police Commission. It has been appointed to make a comprehensive review at the national level of the police system and So on I am quoting :

“There has been a tremendous increase in the quantum and complexity of police tasks in this country. In the decade from 1965 to 1975, crimes (cognisable by police) have increased by 54% as compared to 25% increase in population. Crime figures have shot up to 13.54 lakhs in 1977 compared to 5.56 lakhs in 1954. Raising population, increased migration from rural to urban areas, accommodation, pressure in traffic congestion in urban centres, communal tension, growing exploitation of the backward classes, minority groups and weaker sections and the resultant friction in their interaction with the other groups and the communities, activities of extremists and agitations of different kinds arising from the labour disputes, agrarian unrest, student problem, political activities—have all contributed to serve demands on police resources and capacity. In an atmosphere of increasing stresses and strains allround, police performance has to strike a balance between the individual rights of citizens to articulate their grievances on the one hand and the paramount need for maintenance of public order on the other. Any attempt at police reform had to take a realistic need of the new dimensions of the political aspect arising from these factors...”

This, beautifully serves the point, for us to know what is the present situation in the country and in our society. Under this situation under this background, the whole issue before us will have to be assessed, and if I come to the pendency of cases, they run into lakhs. This is not with reference to Karnataka, but the whole country. What was about 2 lakhs of cases pending in 1962, to-day, it is 20 lakhs pending in Courts. So, this is situation and when the whole country and the atmosphere was surcharged with various stresses and

strains and pulls and pressure and when the towns are growing so fast due to industrial and commercial activities and the population pressure on towns is on increase, what is to be done? Along with this, in towns and cities, there are thousands and thousands and even lakhs of families who have no house to live and who have no occupation. This is another factor to be taken note of. This being the situation, now let us take up why and wherefore of the happenings in Karnataka. Smt. Indira Gandhi, the erstwhile Member of Parliament from Chickamagalur Constituency by a resolution of Parliament, was expelled from the Parliament on the 19th as Hon. Leader of the Opposition himself quoted and that is a fact but where he seems to have not appreciated or he has gone wrong or drawn wrong inferences is here.

Normally, he does not seem to realise and perhaps he does not want to concede being Leader of the Opposition here and a Member of the Janata Party that Smt. Indira Gandhi does not enjoy any semblance of support either in Karnataka or outside the Karnataka. He said? This was no spontaneous people's upsurge' as is being claimed by some apologists of the Congress (I) Party and the State Government. That is what I am referring. Of course, I have no quarrel with the Leader of the Opposition if he were to draw the inference that the upsurge or the agitation was not because of spontaneity, not because Smt. Indira Gandhi, a leader of repute and popularity, but because of the fact according to him that "but a pre-planned reign of terror by the anti-social elements—all these things are happened". Sir, I do not feel that the Leader of the Opposition really meant to say this. Because even the worst political opponent of Smt. Indira Gandhi in this country knows that she has image she has popularity, and she has charisma—these things are known to his party leaders. I do not know whether Sri Bommai, Leader of the Opposition is prepared to concede—but this is a reality which is placed on the face of every one of us. It is a reality which nobody can by mere words or talks or protestation wash out. This cannot be washed out. We know that Smt. Indira Gandhi has got large number of followers in this country. Otherwise, supposing if some one of us had been expelled or imprisoned—lakhs of people would not have volunteered to go to jail. May be in Janata Party there may be leaders who have better image—better charisma—I am not entering to that discussion nor am I prepared to say that they do not possess such popularity or image as the case may be. I may even say because you had that charisma or the popularity you won the Parliament Elections and you got so much of seats in the Parliament. At the same time we too have our own stand here and in spite of your most democratic methods you have adopted, we also won. Let me

also say, because of our most democratic approach in the year 1977 in calling for the elections you had an opportunity to be the Ruling Party at the Centre. That was also a democratic method. Therefore, what I wish to impress upon is this. If it is accused that we as Government as well as the Ruling Party were party or connive or we prepared a plan to this kind of agitation—I can only say with all emphasis at my command that our Hon-Leader of the Opposition is completely wrong. I do not wish to use other words because they become unparliamentary. It is wrong. It not only marshalling the facts but also in drawing inference. I would request the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to realised that this kind of agitation had happened not only in Karnataka but even in Janata Party Ruling States. It happened in Maharashtra where they have managed to take away the present Chief Minister.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ್.—ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಈ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಕರೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದಲ್ಲ ?

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I think my friend is a Member of this House for the first time. He still needs initiation in political matters. Let us see whether you will come here or I will come there. It is a matter of time.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—There is not possibility of both coming on one side,

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—That is why I said the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who is a Member of the Janata Party not only her but even in the Centre he is a leader by virtue of his position. I am sure he is the man who knows the inside working of the Janata Party there and I also know things and mind of the several Janata Party leaders in the Centre, I say the Prime Minister of India is certainly leader of the nation.

SEI S. R. BOMMAI.—He knows the minds of Congress(I) Leaders.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—He knows both Congress(I) leaders as well other leaders of the Janata Party. That is why I said that he is not going to be a party for whatever formula they are likely to bring out. So he is also thinking of dreaming to come together. That is why I said if they are so anxious I am inviting all of them our party.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—The same kind of invitation we also extend to you.

SEI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, I do not want to elaborate on this point. Again, I have to say something to my friend Sri Laxmisagar

who was elected to this Assembly for the first time. He has come into the Assembly for the first time and he may not be completely aware of political leaders.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—Political wisdom is not one's monopoly.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—He is bitterly ignorant of the political leaders.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—Ignorance is not my monopoly.....

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, I would request the hon. Member Mr. Lakshmisagar to go and talk to All India Janata Party President and then let him come to me and talk.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI :— I know the Chief Minister has the privilege and utilised the privilege of meeting our President.

3-00 P.M.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS :— Do not forget that the Janata Party President of today and myself were colleagues for a number of years.

SRI A. LAKSHMI SAGAR :— I do not belong to either of these groups.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS :— That is your difficulty.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್ :— ಇಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲಾ ನೀವು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಏನೋ ತೊಂದರೆ ಇರುವಂತೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್ :— ಏನು ತೊಂದರೆ? I had to say this, because to say that this agitation was not spontaneous is completely wrong, it was a spontaneous agitation and it was because of the fact that in the whole of the country today the weaker sections, the minorities and the Scheduled caste and Scheduled Tribes, at least a Major Section of these classes are in favour of Mrs. Gandhi and her leadership and they follow, they listen and they would like to see here. In That being so, when the Parliament took this decision of expelling Smt. Gandhi from the Lok Sabha, I think they will also concede, that it was a very very extraordinary step, somewhat common and unprecedented. The only instances of expulsion of members were in the 17th and 18th centuries, that too in Britain.

SRI M. SRINIVAS :— in 1976 there was expulsion of a member from the Rajya Sabha.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS :— That was for a different reason, I am not saying anything on that but the effect of such a step was there because Indira Gandhi by any standard was not an ordinary person. She was a person who had ruled this country as Prime

Minister of the country for 11 years and it is during her regime as Prime Minister, that so many of these socio-economic measures were sought to be promulgated and implemented. Therefore, it is quite natural if a large section of those who believed that these measures were in their interest and for their upliftment were to take seriously to their mind and heart the expulsion of their cherished leader. There is nothing unnatural. That is why I said if the whole agitation had been confined to Karnataka State, may be one would suspect there is something behind it. I want to know from the Hon. Leader of the opposition whether it was confined to Karnataka State, whether it was not there in Tamil Nadu, whether it was not there in Maharashtra, whether it was not there in Andhra Pradesh. These are States not ruled by the Janata Party, of course Maharashtra is supported by the Janata Party. For all practical purposes he is a Janata Party Chief Minister. Though he has not officially joined yet, he may join. That is not for us to say, that is a different matter. Then what about U. P.? That is a Janata-party-ruled State. What about Bihar? That is a Janata-party-ruled State. What about Rajasthan? That is a Janata-party-ruled State. What about Madhya Pradesh? That is also a Janata-party-ruled State. Even there also large scale agitation took place, large scale arrests also happened, there were also cases of arson and looting. These are all facts which nobody can deny. Under the circumstances how can the Hon. the Leader of the opposition say that in Karnataka this agitation was connived at by the Congress-I party leaders or by the Government and the Police? I would only say he is not fair at all when he makes these charges. Here I would only wish to bring to the notice of this Hon. House in what manner we tried our best to prevent any violent activity in the State.

Even on the 19th that is the day on which the Lok Sabha was supposed to take a final decision on the Privilege issue, the Airlines timings had not changed. Now the plane in the morning leaves Bangalore to Delhi by 10 or 10-45 A.M. On December 19th the Airlines were following the previous time table. It would come some time by about 12 O'clock or so and it would leave by about 12-30 or 1-00 P.M. I do not exactly remember the time. So, sir, on the 19th of December I did take my journey from Bangalore to Delhi. I straight went into the visitors' gallery in Lok Sabha. Luckily I also had the unique opportunity of seeing the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition Sri Bommai who was also a visitor there on that day. So, Sir, that day before I left this place I took a meeting of the executive of our party. I requested all the members of the Congress-I party both in the Legislature as well as in the Organisation, whoever was available. About 35 to 40 members did attend and in the meeting I appealed and

requested and we passed a resolution to see that if any agitation or violent activity were to take place ————because by then it was almost clear that the Lok Sabha would take a particular stand. So, we did pass a resolution to say that we should avoid violence at all costs. We even sent an appeal saying not to resort to any kind of agitation or activity which would result in violence. We appealed in the first day itself even before I left the place. Then, on 20th December 1978 my colleague Sri K.H. Ranganath and other six Ministers appealed to the people in a joint statement to the people to refrain from violence. I returned to Bangalore on 21st December 1978 and immediately I contacted the Governor, the Ministers and other opposition leaders on the 22nd and discussed law and order situation. I also issued a stern warning through a press conference that the Government would not hesitate to deal with anti-social elements in accordance with law. We also stated that the police irrespective of party or party affiliation they should deal with people who resort to violence and they should deal with them firmly and in accordance with law. There were a number of appeals made to assuage the feelings of the people and also cautioning and warning them not to indulge in violence. So, Sir to say that the State Congress leaders connived or pre-planned, is not correct.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI :— I used the word some congress workers.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS :—I have carefully gone into the statement. You were good enough to say so in the previous draft statement which you subsequently corrected and mentioned cautiously and carefully as some congress leaders.

SRI J. H. PATEL :— He has mentioned only what happened and nothing else.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS :— The police officers had been alerted in advance as early as 16-12-1978. They were even asked to use force to prevent looting, arson and violence, and if the situation demanded even to open fire. These were the instructions. There are communications to prove this. I am not trying to concoct and say now that they were alerted. It is not therefore correct to say that the police were not alerted. What the leader of the opposition has stated is “for the commission as well as omission”. I really do not understand what the Leader of the Opposition means by this. Omission is, they did not act; commission means they have acted. So, the police should neither act nor keep quiet? Is it this is a situation, I am sorry I am not able to understand. How can a police officer not act? then it is omission. If he acts, it is commission. If you want to protect the life and property or prevent certain offences, he has to act. While so

acting he has to resort to certain things. I and you or even the Prime Minister cannot open fire. It is only a police officer who in given authority. They have to act, If they act, for that also you blame. If they do not act, you blame and the resultant effect of all this is rightly stated here. For everything we blame them. I want my friends to read this—"interference under Janata on the increase". This is from the Indian Express. I think you must have gone through it. On 11-1-1979 it has appeared.

SRI A. LAKSHMI SAGAR :— It is better you read the entire report.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS :— I will pass it on. I am sorry it will not be to your advantage.

Then Sir, I want to give the latest position about the incidents—205 Police cases have been registered in respect of major incidents, out of which 30 in Bangalore City and 205 all over the State. 714 Police cases have been registered in respect of minor incidents, out of which in Bangalore it is 211. In all about 5567 persons have been arrested, and most of them have been released subsequently on bail. Amongst those who have been arrested or released, there are 1,176 Congress (I) sympathisers, who had been arrested, and 235 Janata Party sympathisers. For preventive action, 1457 Congress (I) people were taken into custody and 148 Janata Party sympathisers were taken into custody, and others were anti-social elements who are neither Janata nor Congress. In Bangalore City 143 cases have been charge-sheeted. The sections under which the cases registered are, Sections 143, 147, 148, 149, 395 and 435. These sections relate to rioting, arson and looting. 16 Congress (I) Members of the Legislative Assembly were also arrested.

The damage to property is also assessed—the Central Government property to the tune of Rs. 9 lakhs and State Government property to the tune of Rs. 9 lakhs roughly. These are rough figures as per the complaints received. The private property damaged is to the tune of about Rs. 61 lakhs roughly. Police firing took place in 11 instances, in which 19 persons were injured and 9 persons were dead. In the various incidents the number of persons injured are: 83 Congress (I) sympathisers, 81 Janata Party sympathisers, 47 others, and about 326 Police men and 2 homeguards have also been injured. These are the statistics that we have been able to collect regarding these incidents and violent activities of those 2-3 days.

In the entire charge-sheet that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has levelled, I find one silver lining at least, one thing he has admitted and I must thank him for that at least. He says:—

‘It is true that the Government belatedly took some steps to control the situation’.

I think somebody stopped him at that and did not allow him to continue that compliment. Soon he comes back and says:

‘This was not because of any democratic good sense or moral compunctions dawning upon it, but because of its panic that its own days were numbered as the collapse of the law and order had been fast reaching a point of no return.’

Therefore, he had some heart to give us a compliment for at least the belated effort that we made to put an end to the situation. Sir, the first sentence must be his own, but the rest cannot be his, because I have seen the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, on many occasions, even in my private conversation, he appreciated what we did, and he is not such a hard-hearted man to say that everything is bad. So, in his own volition he has made that compliment, but there are other pulls and pressures which prevented him to give us compliments. The statement says: ‘that your days were numbered and so you did this’. At least for the sake of continuing my days, I may state I will have done that, and I hope to that extent you will admit that. The Opposition says it was belated. I never say that it is not a belated effort. The effort was there to prevent lawlessness, hooliganism, goondaism and violence in the State, and there is no need for me to elaborate. If the intention or the will of the Government to put down lawlessness was not there, do you mean to say that we would have gone to the extent of opening 11 firings killing 9 people. Was it not because there was a will on our part to prevent all these things?

Another accusation persistently made was about belated action in the beginning. Sir, as I have already submitted, though I was not there on the 19th, the Police people had been alerted three days earlier that in the event of a situation arising necessitating stern action, they should take action. But the type of situation that came about as a result of Smt. Gandhi’s arrest and expulsion, was such that it was not possible for anybody to visualise. If supposing it was said that the Karnataka Government had failed to visualise such a situation, then I will have to say that every other State in the country had also failed. Can we say that? So, are you going to make enquiries in Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Maharashtra?

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—Our accusation is your failed. If other States have failed, is that your justification?

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, I was submitting that this situation was not peculiar to Karnataka. This happened all over the country, even in Delhi it happened under the very nose and eyes of the Central Government. There have been many instances where Police had to resort to firing, lathi charges and bursting of teargas shell.

3-30 P. M.

So, this kind of agitation was not peculiar to Karnataka. Again another important factor which I would like the Hon. members of this House kindly to know is this: the type of violence and agitation that took place—these have taken places in places where generally such things would not take place. There are some places which are considered as troublesome spot, but there are many places where such violence would not normally occur. This time it is a fact that our people and the government was taken a bit unaware by agitations that took place in areas and places where normally we would not expect. That is another peculiar feature which we have witnessed during this recent agitation. To prove the point beyond doubt, officially none of us have connived or even suggested that the agitation should go on though Hon. Leader of the Opposition does concede that agitation is the democratic right of every person or a party, even that right we did not exercise. In his own district viz., Dharwar, when my party people contacted me and they wanted to launch an agitation or take out some morecha or procession, I warned them over the telephone and prevented them from having any such meetings or even a procession; because I felt that any kind of meeting or procession if somebody were to take to some kind of lawlessness that would kindle up so many other things like arson and looting. Therefore wherever the people wanted my permission, I prevented them, I did not give them permission, nor was any permission allowed to our party people in Bangalore City. We had promulgated ban order in 145 places. We took action to promulgate ban orders because we knew if this was allowed, there would be a lot of scope for violent activities.

Leaving aside the so many accusations and charges that have been made in his statement, I will come to the operative part of his statement. There are two things mentioned here (1) We demand a judicial enquiry by a sitting judge of the High Court in all aspects of the disturbances which occurred following the expulsion and imprisonment of Smt. Indira Gandhi including the acts of omission

and commission of the State Police and the Administration (2) and payment of adequate compensation to the victims.

I will take the compensation first. Every time compensation has not been given in previous instances. In 1973 Border dispute was there, a lot of damage was done to the property which was roughly estimated at Rs. 1.13 crores. Food riots in 1973 took place, the approximate damage was roughly about Rs. 70 lakhs; communal riots took place in Mandya, the damage was approximately to the tune of Rs. 80 lakhs; in the expo agitation in 1970 the damage was approximately Rs. one crore. In the case of Mandya communal clash, we did give some amount of compensation to people who were poor and whose property had been completely destroyed—some in the form of grant, certain amount in the form of interest free or small interest loan, not in all cases compensation was given. Here I am not suggesting that compensation should not be given at all. Let us take a sympathetic view and see wherever people have lost their savings or their belongings and who have been rendered helpless and rendered ineffective from the point of view of earning their livelihood, certainly we shall consider favourably such cases and to some extent we can think of giving compensation to them. But there are instances where though they have lost properties, there are many people who have insured their properties with the Insurance Companies, there are instances which I know they get the compensation through the Insurance Cos. for what all they have insured. Nowadays because of this kind of anti-social activities and because of the fact that people who have enough means, always try to put glass panels in front of their houses which even a small pebble can break the glass such kind of people will have received insurance compensation. Such cases might be there. I know there are some instances where people did come forward with complaints saying that their property had been looted; after verification some have said that their complaint was wrong and false and some have said that they have not lost the property, out of fear they had said it. There are such instances also. Anyway, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said that as a matter of principle compensation should be given; the principle we accept, but to what extent, to whom, is a matter which he will appreciate also that we cannot indiscriminately say that whoever comes forward, he should be given compensation, you too do not expect because it has to be paid by the exchequer, that all cannot be compensated that way. Supposing the hon. members of this House may know some instances which might not have come to the notice of the Government, if they point out such instances, certainly we will consider them.

Regarding the judicial enquiry, Sir, here I know this is a point on which the Opposition Leader is very insistent, perhaps he thinks that this is a prestige matter.

I don't know how he thinks about it. Nevertheless, I must say that there is no prestige involved in this either on our side or their side. But all of us should understand and appreciate one factor, viz. whatever we propose to do, the steps we take should not in any way result in affecting the morale of the police administration. If the morale of the police administration is undermined then, no Government—whether of Janata Govt. or Congress Govt.—can maintain effectively the law and order and function. This is the fundamental and basic point which we should all realise. That is one of the reasons why the Commissioner who has been recently appointed for one Central Commission, come out with such a statement. Whether it is Janata or Congress or Communist, if political interferences were to be there then the police administration will in course of time collapse. Then the whole trouble starts. But he has pointed out one thing. He said that we wanted the military to come over here and take position. I could only submit to the House that what he said is not correct. We never asked for military. Of course, we did take the help of CRP and BSF. Many a time, other States have also taken such help from CRP and BSF. Because, if violent activities were to take place throughout the State, everybody knows that the existing police force is not at all adequate to meet the situation. Even in neighbouring states, whenever such situation arise, we used to send our forces. Similarly, we have also taken the help from the Border Security Force. Likewise, we have taken the help from CRP also.

When we have taken the help of these forces, that doesn't mean that the law and order situation of the State has been broken down. Yes, we had to take the help because, the situation was heating up and we felt that our own police force could not be sufficient to take command of the situation all over the State. That is why we had to take some help. This is not a strange thing to Karnataka alone. Even in U.P. Govt. had taken such help from CRP and BSF. In Bihar also they have taken. That does not mean that because the situation has become worse, so we have taken their help. When there was a curfew in Aligarh and when the situation gone to worst in Ahmedabad, there, Government have not collapsed. At that rate nobody can say that because such things happened, the Government also collapsed. So, the information that we wanted to bring military here is not correct. We never asked for it.

Further, the Leader of the Opposition made a reference to the Governor's statement. But I want to refrain from saying anything

about that matter. I don't want to say anything in that matter. I could give some cases where judicial enquiries have been held and where not held etc.,

Firstly, in 1977, in Swadeshi Mills disturbance, 12 persons have been killed, but no judicial enquiry has been ordered. Secondly, in a clash in Sambal, 13 persons have been killed and 60 shops have been looted. But no judicial enquiry has been ordered. But a Divisional Commissioner has been appointed to enquiry into the incident.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—Will you kindly enlighten us where judicial enquiry has been ordered?

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I will give that also. In another incident at Panthnagar, in an Agricultural University 200 rounds have been fired. Officially, 13 persons have been killed and 83 persons have been injured. Many bodies have been burnt in sugarcane field. There judicial enquiry has been ordered.

On 13-4-1978 in Amrithsar, 17 persons have been killed and 100 persons injured in Nirahankari clash. But no judicial enquiry was held. On 1-5-1978 at Agra, in a clash between Harijan and caste Hindus, there was no judicial enquiry. In the Maratwada riot which took place in a very large scale, and continued for 11 days, resulting in a loss of more than one crore worth properties, and 1000 houses have been burnt-down. But no judicial enquiry has been ordered. On 5-8-1978 in Nagpur, four persons were killed and 24 hurt, but no judicial enquiry has been ordered. In Aligarh clash which lasted for two months, curfew imposed, 12 persons killed and 34 houses burnt down. There judicial enquiry has been ordered. On 5-6-1978, in Nirahankari clash 3 persons killed. But no judicial enquiry. And in a State like Bihar, no day passes without an incident of severe nature. In Belchi incident also, there was no judicial enquiry. Subsequently, in backward class reservation agitation, there was so much violent and disturbances going on there, Many Universities have been closed down. Yet, there was no judicial enquiry.

There are instances and instances, where though the magnitude of the agitation or the violent activities are more severe, judicial enquiries have not been held. There are few instances where judicial enquiries have been conducted. This only means that judicial enquiry can be conducted depending upon the gravity of the situation. But if you say in an omnibus way it is difficult. In your statement it is like this:

“We demand a Judicial Enquiry by a sitting Judge of the High Court into all aspects of the disturbances which occurred following the expulsion and imprisonment of Smt.

Gandhi including the acts of omission and commission of the State Police and the Administration and payment of adequate compensation to the victims''.

How can anybody conceive of such a judicial enquiry for all administrative acts, for all the Police acts and for all the things that have happened in the State? Is it ever possible? Is it ever feasible and is it ever practicable? If the hon'ble Leader of the Opposition were to force this on us, then he has absolutely no voice if I were to demand that there should be judicial enquiry throughout India. So, Sir, we cannot make a judicial enquiry for all the happenings and omissions and commissions and all the administrative acts. If you have no confidence, Constitutionally there is provision; you have every right to move a No-Confidence Motion and throw us out. All this amounts to lack of confidence in my Government, or in my party. O.K. I can say I have no confidence in the Central Government, which has taken such an unprecedented, unique action of expelling a member. I have not said it. Well, Sir, I would have to say because of their actions, such a situation developed. Whatever they have done, it is theirs; I cannot here question because in the wisdom of the Parliament and the Lok Sabha they have said that this person should be expelled. This is the resultant effect of that action. It is not the result of my action. It is because of that action of expelling a member of the House of the stature of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, such a situation has developed. These things have happened not only in Karnataka but everywhere. In these circumstances, let my friend, the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition think about it whether such a thing can be possible, to go in for a judicial enquiry in this fashion. That is why I had pleaded with him that this can be discussed as was pointed out by the C.P.I member Mr. B.V. Kakkilaya on the Motion of Thanks, for which five days have been allotted. He was not pleased to agree. All right, he wanted to make a statement and he has made it. He himself has said: I do not want to spell out all the evils'. All Right, if he does not want to, I cannot compell. But here again, does he agree with me or not when I say that the hon'ble members of this House both on this side as well as on that side have their own experience and have to be allowed to speak out what is what? Charges are not merely on some of the Congress leaders; there are charges against some of the Janatha Party leaders as well, which I know. There are places and instances, where Congress party offices have also been attacked, Congress members have been attacked and so, it is not as if the Janatha Party leaders and the party as a whole was completely a silent spectator or witness. I do not say thereby that the leaders or the President of the party has instigated.

I do not want to make any such accusation because, I know for certain they have not instigated. I know for certain that the leader and the president of the party have not instigated. He will also agree that if somebody does something in a village or a taluka, it cannot be attributed to the leaders. Likewise, I only appeal to the Leader of the Opposition: 'Kindly do not attribute motives'. It is not fair. That is all I can say. It is true that some members are suspected; that is why we have arrested 16 M.L. As. of our own party. If we have instigated why should we have arrested them? Irrespective of position, everybody should be dealt with according to law, if he were to indulge in any acts of violence or unlawful activity. Sixteen members have been arrested. The House has a right to know all the aspects and what are the things that have happened in a given place. Without knowing all these things, how do you expect me to accept to do any kind of enquiry in an omnibus way? This simply means or it is as good as expressing no-confidence in the Government. If he feels that there is no confidence, it is for the Leader of the Opposition to move a motion or resolution. It is highly impracticable. Even if we accept it, it cannot be put into practice; it cannot be administratively man-managed at all. In these circumstances, Sir, I am sorry it will not be possible to accept the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition. We are not closing the Session. Still the debate is there on the Motion of Thanks. Every time they have the right to make reference to whatever has happened, to criticise and to offer suggestions but it cannot be the monopoly of only a few people, because these incidents have not taken place in one district or taluk. They have taken place in Bijapur, S. Kanara, Dharwar, Bangalore, Mysore and so many other places. Hon'ble members are there from all over the State; they have their experience; they have come to know certain things. Let these things be spoken to on the floor of the House, taking advantage of the opportunity that is given by this House during the course of the Sessions and the Motion of Thanks and so many other places. Let us see whether any individual incidents are there, where any enquiry becomes necessary. It will not depend on X, Y or Z but on the situation and the facts that come before us. Depending on that we may think of it. To say in an omnibus way 'judicial enquiry for everything', I am sorry it is not correct. That is my submission.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, as usual, the Hon. Chief Minister has made strenuous efforts to defend a very bad case. I will not go into the All-India politics and the affairs of the Central Government and other States. From the speech I could gather that definite specific instructions were given to the Police to take normal

precautionary measures but I was not able to understand from the speech of the Hon. Chief Minister what are the precautionary measures or action taken by the Police.

4-00 P.M.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I will read out.....

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—The Police, normally, when they visualise such a situation, issue prohibitory orders well in advance, make detentions of anti-social elements and also trouble-shooters. One week earlier of the actual passing of the Resolution in the Lok Sabha, the Prime Minister has moved an amendment motion for imprisonment and expulsion but I failed to understand the statement of the Hon. Chief Minister which says on the one side that all steps were taken and on the other, he says the State Government was taken unawares.

MR. SPEAKER.—You have made a statement and the Hon. Chief Minister has replied. So, the matter will be closed at that stage.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—I am not making a speech. I am not able to understand the statement of the Hon. Chief Minister. Therefore, by way of clarification, I am asking him to clear some of the points. I am not going to make a long speech. The Hon. Chief Minister on the one side has stated that the Police took all possible precautionary measures but on the other side, he admits that the State Government was taken unawares. These two are contradictory statements. I know there are competent Officers in the Police Department. I am proud of our State Police. They can stop all the atrocities within 24 hours of the issue of orders. If orders would have been issued, they could have brought the atrocities to book, but orders were not issued in this case. That is the point which I want to make it clear.

Sofar as other matters are concerned, I am not going to narrate the details of all those cases because many of them have come in the Press and the Hon. Chief Minister is well acquainted with all the facts through his own source and through representations from the public. Therefore, I don't like to go into details. I could narrate hundreds of instances of inaction of the Police; Under the very nose of the Police, looting, arson etc., had taken place. I have gone through the representations and reports that I have received and I have gone round the State and discussed the matter with the officials and others. Then, the Hon. Chief Minister has pointed out that there should be a debate on this matter. I did agree yesterday that after making a statement, at the end of my statement, I would move a motion and the Hon. Speaker who has got the power to suspend other business, may give permission for the discussion on the motion

moved by me. We have done it on previous occasions. I also agreed that there may be a debate on this matter for two days and at the end of the debate, the Hon. Chief Minister could give his reply. I have agreed for that course of action. But ultimately, it was suggested that I should make a statement and the Hon. Chief Minister would reply. I was persuaded to accept it because I am confident that the Hon. Chief Minister is well-aware of the situation, particularly in this State. I am confident that what has happened in this State was a fit case for him to agree for a judicial inquiry without being asked. There are instances wherein judicial inquiries were ordered without being asked. I would like to quote only one instance where Smt. Indira Gandhi when she was the Prime Minister had ordered for a judicial inquiry without being asked. There was a demonstration by the Socialist Party of India before the Parliament. A firing took place. Immediately, she received the message and before it was being asked by the Opposition, she voluntarily declared and appointed a Judicial Inquiry. I am quoting the instance of the Leader of the Congress(I) Party to whom the Hon. Chief Minister is proud of and he ought to be and there are instantaneous instances where Government have come forward to appoint a Judicial Inquiry. Now, sir, after hearing him, I gathered an impression that in principle he has agreed for a Judicial probe but not in an omni-bus way. I do quite understand. I do concede that because that cannot be an inquiry into all the incidents that had taken place during that period throughout the State. The judicial inquiry will have to be conducted in respect of a particular incidents. He has not opposed to judicial probe. That is my impression.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Judicial probe or any probe, if there are instances to be looked-into, certainly we can think of. But let there be discussion. I did not say any thing beyond that.

SRI S. R. BOMMAL.—If those details are to be worked out, it is alright. If he accepts in principle for a judicial probe on major incidents that had taken place in the state, then the particular terms of reference can be worked-out. I do concede that point. Instead of omni-bus way, the particulars can be worked-out and for that, we are prepared. If the Hon. Chief Minister can discuss the details about it, we will be agreeable.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I can discuss it with whom? I have said if there is any probe is to be done that has to be done only after knowing all aspects. There are various experiences of various members. Then only any point which could be considered seriously. I did not say that I don't concede to it all-this probe or that probe but I merely said that such things are to be probed into. Let us see. That is all what I have said. I stand by it even now.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—If the Hon. Chief Minister has said that there should be a debate on this issue, I am prepared even now Sir. If he is agreeable and if the Hon. Speaker permits me, then I will read my statement.....

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಿ.....

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—There are number of instances where statement have been converted into motions and debate has taken place. I would appeal to the Hon. Chief Minister to agree to it because he knows the case better. He is very well aware of the incidents, and therefore, it is better if he agrees for the judicial probe. Then the details may be worked out. That will be my first appeal. Secondly, if the Hon. Chief Minister desire for a debate I appeal to the Hon. Speaker that my statement itself be converted as resolution and a debate could be commenced now itself. We are prepared for it.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕಂಡಕ್ಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೊಡಿ.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—You have got ample power. Let every Member of this House participate in it. Let them express their views. I do not want to come in their way. I agree for this course of action because of the importance of the matter which is before us. Therefore, I request the Hon. Speaker to convert the statement made by me into a resolution. Let the debate takes place.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, again and again Hon. Leader of the Opposition is pointing out something. I did say there is ample time for discussing this matter by way of motion or a resolution. But if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to convert the statement itself as a motion or the resolution as the case may be— I say it is not fair. The understanding was that a statement could be read by the Leader of the Opposition after the question hour is over even though it was not permitted under the Rules of this House. But still we gave up all these things and we have permitted the Leader of the Opposition to make a statement. Now, they are asking to convert the statement into a motion. It is not correct and fair. If they desire for a debate, let them send a motion in whatever manner and it will be taken up according to the Rules of the House. Without following the rules and procedure how can we take it up in advance and a debate could be allowed.

Secondly, so far as instructions given by us the Hon. Leader of the Opposition wanted some clarification on that. I will read them

“This is an instruction dated 16th December 1978. from I.G. Police to Deputy I. G. Police and Superintendents of Police—will stay in Headquarters from 18th December

1978 to maintain the law and order situation that may arise. Confirm receipt of this message”.

2. The second one on 19th by Telex.

“Refer this Office T.P.....previous letter regarding your remaining in Headquarters on 18th December 1978.

In view of latest political development about the expulsion of Smt Indira Gandhi from Parliament on 19th Please take all precautions to maintain law and order and get this office appraise on this.

Again messages were transmitted to the Deputy Inspector General of Police, Superintendent of Police, Superintendent of Police, Railways on the 19th December 1978.

“Refer this Office T. P. Message dated 16th December 1978 regarding your remaining in Headquarters in view of the latest political development about the expulsion of Smt. Indira Gandhi.

Again on 20th December 1978 reports are coming from, from that---hooliganism. goondaism, violence etc.,

Inspector General of Police has issued instructions to all the Superintendents of Police and Deputy Inspector General of Police that all necessary steps should be taken to put down unlawful activities. Please co-ordinate and intimate that law and order and public confidence are maintained at any cost.

Then, there is another instruction issued on 19th December 1978.

Refer this office message even No.....dated

“In the wake of proposed final action of Parliament against Smt. Indira Gandhi on privilege issue, Congress (I) Units in Southern State are likely to resort to agitation in front of Central Government Offices and disrupt trains Adequate bundobust should be made to prevent untoward incidents and maintain law and order and smooth running of trains, Central Government Offices etc.,

Again there is instruction dated 20th December 1978, All Superintendents of Police should be directed to take very firm action while dealing with the mobs whenever there is an attempt to loot the properties whether Government or private. There should be no hesitation to take utmost step to prevent them from mischief including opening of fire as a measure to prevent such occurrence. This should be followed by quick arrest of culprits concerned. Prohibitory Orders

should be got promulgated if it is not done till now in the affected areas." This is on the 20th December 1978. These are the instructions that were issued.

So, instructions have been issued. What I said was that although instructions were issued incidents being took place in areas where normally we did not expect. To that extent we are unaware. Therefore, with the force which was not adequate and sometimes they cannot also immediately rush because their life will be in danger. There are such instances also. That is to say the violence has erupted in areas where we normally would not expect from there. This is the point.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Mr. Speaker. Sir, I have heard the instructions, But my submission is when Members are ready to give all the materials we can take up the debate and I hope the hon. Chief Minister would agree for such a debate. Because according to the Chief Minister there were 9 deaths. According to me there were looting and the damage was to the extent of crores of rupees. Therefore, a judicial probe is required wherever major incidents have happened on 19th, 20th & 21st December 1978. So, we can discuss the particulars and details during the discussion. Therefore I urge upon the Chief Minister that he should agree in principle for a judicial probe and details can be worked out after having a discussion on this issue.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, I do not know what are those details to be worked out. That is why I said when we take up for discussion there may be certain incidents which myself and they may not be knowing and even police may also know something of the incidents which you have made in the statement. It was also stated in your statement that women were molested. So far we have not heard any one such incident nor it has been brought to the notice of the police. Of course there may be some instances which require serious attention. In all those cases police have taken prompt action. I am sure you will also agree and you will be one with me that we cannot unnecessarily destroy the image of the police. Because there is a kind of feeling that whenever incidents of this type happen we demand for judicial probe and enquires are instituted against the incidents. I am of the view that we should not go upto that level. That is my point,

Therefore, what I say is let us sit and discuss the matter when it is taken up and I think so many instances which we are unaware may also come to our notice.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Sir, there are instances where the judicial probe has been ordered without demanding it. I thought our Chief Minister would also follow that principle. I would make it clear that

judicial probe is not to demoralise police administration but for better and efficient functioning of the department. I know the Chief Minister is convinced of it but still he is not agreeing. Unless the Government agrees in principle to have a judicial probe it will not be possible for us to co-operate. Major instances and details can be worked out latter on. In fact everything is documented by press and official releases. If a judicial probe is there people will come and give evidence. Otherwise I would take that the Chief Minister is not for a judicial enquiry in spite of justification for such a probe I would again request through you that a judicial probe be agreed upon by the Government. This is a just demand.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮಾದೇಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಗಾಂವ್‌ಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಏನಂದರೆ, ಹಾಡಿದ್ದೇ ಹಾಡೋ ಕಿಸಬಾಯಿ ದಾಸ ಎಂದು. ನಾನು ಈ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದರೆ ನಾವು ಏನೇ ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು ಜುಡಿಷಿಯಲ್ ಎನ್‌ಕ್ವೈರಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಮನಸ್ಸಿಲ್ಲದೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಿದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನೇ ಪುನಃ ಪುನಃ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅಂದರೆ ನೀವು ಏನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿ ನಾನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಜಗ್ಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ನನ್ನ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಿದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನೇ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಏನನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಸುಮಾರು 30-40 ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆಡಳಿತದ ಅನುಭವ ಇದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷರ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಕಾನೂನು ಭಂಗ ಚಳುವಳಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಆದ ಗಲಭೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನೊಂದ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಹಾತ್ಮಾ ಗಾಂಧೀಜಿಯವರೂ ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ ಅಂಥ ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷರ ಕೂಡ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ತನಿಖೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನೊಂದ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂದವೇಲೇ ಇವತ್ತು ನಾವು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತಿದ್ದುಕೊಂಡು ಇಂಥ ಗಲಭೆಗಳಾದಾಗ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ತನಿಖೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನೊಂದ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೊಡದೇ ಹೋಗುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಇದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಒಂದು ತತ್ವದ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಮಂಡ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಗಲಾಟೆ ಆದಾಗ ಇದೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ನೊಂದ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಲಾಲ್ ಬಹದ್ದೂರ್ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಯವರು ರೈಲ್ವೆ ಸಚಿವರಾಗಿದ್ದಾಗ ಎಲ್ಲೋ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ರೈಲು ಬಿದ್ದು ಹೋಯಿತೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಅದು ಸತ್ಪುರುಷರ ಲಕ್ಷಣ ನೀವೂ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕೀರ್ತಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚುತ್ತದೆ. ನೀವು ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಮಾದರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಕೆಲವು ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಇತರ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಇತರ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಮಾದರಿಯಾದ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದೆಯೆಂದು ನಿಮಗೆ ನೀವೆ ಹೊಗಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ನೀವು ಆ ರೀತಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾದರೆ ನಾವು ಮತ್ತೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಪ್ರಕರಣವನ್ನೇ ಮತ್ತೆ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಏಷ್ಯ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು ಇದುವರಿಗೆ ತಾವು ಏನು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೆನಪು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಡಿ. ದೇವೇಗೌಡ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಬಹಳ ತೀವ್ರತೆಯಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ಬಹಳ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಟ್ಟು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ದಿಸಂಬರ್ ೧೯ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಬೃಹ್ಮ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ತೀವ್ರತೆಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಜುಡಿಷಿಯಲ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಮಾಡುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ನಾಯಕರು ಏನೊಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಸದನದ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದು ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದಂಥಾದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದಲೇ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ದಿಸೆಂಬರ್ ೨೨ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಅವರು ಏನೊಂದು ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸದನದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದದ್ದು ಎಂದರೆ ೧೯ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಸಂಜೆ ೬ ಗಂಟೆಯಿಂದ ೨೦ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಸಂಜೆ ೬ ಗಂಟೆಯವರೆಗೆ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ನಿಷ್ಕ್ರಿಯತೆಯಿಂದ ಏನು ಇದ್ದರು ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ತನಿಖೆ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಗಲಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ೯ ಜನ ಸತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಲಾಟಿ, ಪುಂಡಾಟಿಕೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆಗಲಿ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ತನಿಖೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅಲ್ಲ. We have specifically mentioned in our demand that the Police machinery was completely a silent spectator from 19th evening to 20th evening. This is our demand. ೧೬ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಐ.ಜಿ.ಪಿ. ಯವರಿಗೆ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದುದಾಗಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ, ಮತ್ತು ನಂಬುತ್ತೇನೆ. If I believe that version then why the subordinate officers including the rank of S.Ps were silent for 24 hours in some of the places where the situation was so grave.

4-30P.M.

MR. SPEAKER.—I am not clarified as to what he wants to say.

SRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA. —If you want to shut me out, I will keep quiet.

MR. SPEAKER.—I want to know from him whether he was discussing this matter or whether he wants to go into the details

SRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA.—From the 20th evening the police has done excellently well. I do not dispute that. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಯಾವುದರ ಮೇಲೆ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅವರು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ನಾವು ನಮ್ಮ ನಾಯಕರು ಸೇರಿ ಯಾವುದರ ಮೇಲೆ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯಾಗ ಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ದಿನಾಂಕ ೧೯ರ ಸಂಜೆ, ೨೦ರ ಸಂಜೆ ೬ ಗಂಟೆಯವರೆಗೆ ನಡೆದಂಥ ಘಟನೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅದು ಇದೆ. ೧೬ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಐ.ಜಿ.ಪಿ.ಯವರಿಗೆ ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಇಷ್ಟು, ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಇಂದಿರಾಗಾಂಧಿಯವರನ್ನು ಅರಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ತಮಗೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿಯೇ ಗೊತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿಯೇ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಕ್ಷನ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಸೈಪಲ್ ಬ್ರಾಂಚ್ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಇದ್ದರೂ, ಸೈಟ್ ಇಂಟೆಲಿಜೆನ್ಸ್ ಅವರು ಇದ್ದರೂ ಸರಿಯಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಕ್ಷನ್ ಕೊಡದೇ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಲೋಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎನ್ನುವ ಒಂದು ಭಾವನೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಐ.ಜಿ.ಪಿ.ಯವರಿಗೆ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಕ್ಷನ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಗಲಭೆ ನಡೆದುದರ ಹಿಂದೆಯಾರೇ ಇರಲಿ, ಜನತಾ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರೇ ಗಲಭೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರೇ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಯಾರು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಬರಲಿ, ೨೪ ಗಂಟೆಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ನಿಷ್ಕ್ರಿಯತೆಯಿಂದ ಇದುದಕ್ಕೆ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ತನಿಖೆ ಇಗಬೇಕು.

ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ, ಎಲ್ಲ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ, ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ತಾವು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತೀರಿ. ರಾಜಕೀಯವನ್ನು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ, ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯವಿರುತ್ತದೆ, ೨೦ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಲಾಟಿಯಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ, ಫೈರಿಂಗ್ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಜನತಾ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಅಥವಾ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಐ ಪಕ್ಷ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಅದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಾವು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಹಿಂದೆ ಆದ ಕೆಲವು ಘಟನೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಉದಾಹರಿಸಿದಿರಿ. ನಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಕದ ರಾಜ್ಯವಾದ ಆಂಧ್ರದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದರು,

ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಫೈರಿಂಗ್ ನಡೆದಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಂಪ್ಯಾರೆಟಿವ್ ಚಿತ್ರ ಈವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಬೇಕಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ನೀವು ನ್ಯಾಷನಲ್ ಪ್ರೋಲೀಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯೂ ಹೇಳಿರುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಸೈಪಲ್ ಆಗಿ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಸಪೈಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ. ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರತಿಪಾದಿಸಿ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ನಗರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದಂಥ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ವಿಶೇಷ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಇಂಟಲಿಜೆನ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರೋಸಸ್ ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಸಮರ್ಥವಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. Due to the stress and strain the present machinery is incapable ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ರವರೇ ಹೇಳಲಿ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ತಾವು ಜುಡಿಸಿಯಲ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಲು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. You are capable of replying, if not to your full satisfaction, at least to our satisfaction. He has sufficient material for that. But that is a different matter. If the House wants a discussion I welcome it. Everybody has got the right to express his views. On these issues a judicial commission is required. Please see that on this particular issue the Government agrees for a commission.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್.—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ದೇವೇಗೌಡರು ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೊತ್ತು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ೧೯ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಂದು ನಡೆದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಜೊತೆಗೆ ೨೦ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಿಂದ ಎಫೆಕ್ಟಿವ್ ಆಗಿ ಸೈಪಲ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಕೂಡ ಹೇಳಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈಗ ನಾನು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಅವರು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ಎನ್‌ಕ್ವಯರಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ವಿಷಯ ಏನು ಇದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದು ಮಾಡೋಣವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮತ್ತೆ ಜನತಾ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಮೆಮೋರಾಂಡಮ್ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಇಂಥ ವಿಚಾರವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಜನರಲ್ ಆಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇದೆ. ನಾನು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆಂದರೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ದೇವೇಗೌಡರ ಮನೋಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಅವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆ ನಡೆದಂಥ ಘಟನೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರೋಲೀಸ್‌ನವರು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲವೆನ್ನುವ ವಿಚಾರ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ನಾವು ನೀವು ಕುಳಿತು ಮಾತನಾಡೋಣ. ಆದರೆ ಪ್ರೋಲೀಸ್‌ನವರೇ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಾನು ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಯಾವ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರೋಲೀಸ್‌ರು ನಿಷ್ಕ್ರಿಯರಾಗಿದ್ದರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಹೇಳದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದದ್ದಾಗಿ ಪ್ರೋಲೀಸ್‌ರು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಒಂದೇ ಮಾತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಒಪ್ಪದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ನಾವು ಸಹಕಾರ ನೀಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಇದು ಸರಿಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ದೇವೇಗೌಡರೂ ಹೇಳಲಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಡಿ. ದೇವೇಗೌಡ.—ನಮ್ಮ ಮೆಮೋರಾಂಡಮನ್ನು ೨೨ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವೆಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರಾಮಾಣಿಕವಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ "With his experience in administration he must have gone through that memorandum". ಇಷ್ಟು ಅಳವಾದ ಅನುಭವಿರತಕ್ಕ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೆಮೋರಾಂಡಮನ್ನು ಓದಿ ನೋಡಬೇಡಿ ಇರಲಾರರು. ನಾವು ಆ ಮೆಮೋರಾಂಡಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಇಂಥಂಥ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅನಾಹುತವಾಗಿವೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ದಯಮಾಡಿ ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಆ ಮೆಮೋರಾಂಡಮನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿ ನೋಡಲಿ. ನಮ್ಮ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ತನಿಖೆಯಾಗಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು ಮತ್ತು ನೋಂದಪರಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರ ನೀಡಬೇಕು

ಎಂಬುದು. ಆ ೨೪ ಗಂಟೆಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಮೆಷಿನರಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. We have specifically mentioned that in the memorandum We do not demand judicial probe for the whole incidents. In our memorandum we are very cautious.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—How can we bring it here now? We can sit and discuss it some time later. I am prepared for it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ.ವಿ. ಕಕ್ಕಿಲಾಯ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ದೇವೇಗೌಡರು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು, “೧೯ ಮತ್ತು ೨೦ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿವಸ ೨೪ಗಂಟೆಗಳ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದಾಥ ಘಟನೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನಾಹುತ ನಡೆದಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮೆಮೋರಾಂಡಮ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯಾಗಿ ಬೇಕು” ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ಸ್ಥಳಗಳನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡೋಣ. ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿ ನಂತರ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಸದನದಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು; ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ಇವತ್ತು ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆಯೋ ಇದು ಅಸಾಧಾರಣವಾದ ಚರ್ಚೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಲಾ ಅಂಡ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ೧೯ ಮತ್ತು ೨೦ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು....

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನೀವು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ನಮ್ಮ ಅಪವಾದ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಪ್ರಚೋದನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಇನ್‌ವಾಲ್ವ್ ಆಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಲಾ ಅಂಡ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಮುರಿಯುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ.....

MR SPEAKER.—The hon. member may please resume his seat.

SRI BHEEMANNA KHANDRE.—Sir, I want to convince through you to the Hon'ble Chief Minister that he should concede for a Judicial Enquiry.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಕೆಲವು ನಿಯಮಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಪಾಲನೆ ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನೀವು ಗೌರವವಾಗಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ.

SRI S.R. BOMMAL.—We have made our point very clear. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕು. ಇದು ವಾದದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಒಪ್ಪತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. We have specifically stated;

“We demand a Judicial Enquiry by a sitting Judge of the High Court into all aspects of the disturbances which occurred following the expulsion and imprisonment of Smt. Indira Gandhi including the acts of omission and commission of the State Police and the Administration and payment of compensation to the victims”

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್.—ನಾವು ನಿಯಮಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಅಥವಾ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಜೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಲಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. There are instances where in such situations the Speaker has exercised his discretion and permitted a discussion. It is only my appeal.

MR. SPEAKER.—It is not my discretion. I will have to consult the House. I am guided by the House. ತಾವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಮತ್ತೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ನಿರ್ಧಾರ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಲ್ಲ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಆದರೆ ನಾವು ಹೇಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದು ?

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—The House may be taken into confidence. I have said that our future course of action will depend upon the reply of the Chief Minister.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಡಿ. ದೇವೇಗೌಡ.—ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವಂತೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಬೇರೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನು ಅನಾಹುತ ನಡೆದಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು, ಅವರಿಗೂ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು. ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಾದರೆ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಭೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಲಿ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ನಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮಾಡುವುದೇನೂ ಬೇಡ. ನಮ್ಮ ಬೇಡಿಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟೆ. ಏನಾದರೆ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಆಗಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ ೨೨ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಿಂದ ಈ ನಿಮಿಷದವರಿಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ನಿಲುವು ಇದೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲಾ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಮೊರೆಯಾಂಶವನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇಷ್ಟು ಗಡನವಾದ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ನಾನು ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಬೇಡಿಕೆ ಮಾನ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾನು ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. It is a very important issue.

SRI M. C. NANAIAH.—Could the statement of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition be a subject matter for discussion in the House purporting to act under Rule 306 ? In the Lok Sabha when a similar matter came up, the Leader of the Opposition Sri Stephen was permitted to raise such a matter in respect of Simastipur Election. The matter ended and no further discussion took place. If further discussion is necessary, it should be in the form of a motion, and a motion should be brought.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಾನೇನೂ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮುಂದೆ ಎರಡು ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಮೊದಲನೆಯದು ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯಾಗಬೇಕು. ಎಂಬುದು ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ನೊಂದವರಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು. ಈ ನಮ್ಮ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ನಾವು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೆಪಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್.—ಅವರ ವನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಬಂದಿದೆ. ನಾವು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ ನಿಮ್ಮನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. It is the prerogative of the Government to accept or not. You cannot compel it at the point of a bouynet ನೀವು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೀರೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ನೀವು ಒಪ್ಪದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ನಾವು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಇದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. This attitude is not correct. Sir, he has been consistently asking for a Judicial probe,

I do not understand this attitude. Nobody can dictate for a Judicial probe. There are instances where judicial probe has not been done. If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition wants to compel me, I am sorry I can not be compelled or cowed down. I have been saying what kind of probe is to be done. I accepted the suggestion that he can make a statement and I will reply. Now the hon. member Sri Deve Gowda says: 'what happens to our memorandum'? I said that it cannot be a subject here. It is not a paper on the Agenda. I am prepared to discuss with them. What kind of enquiry should be made and at what point is a matter to be carefully thought of. I am prepared to discuss it. So far as compensation is concerned, I have made the position clear. But so far as the question of treating this as a motion, how can it be done? I am glad Sri Deve Gowda did not suggest that. There is no point in saying that it should be treated as a motion. The Government should be convinced what are the matters to be enquired into. To say that 'if you do not accept we do not co-operate' is not correct. This should not be the attitude.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಡಿ. ದೇವೇಗೌಡ.—ನಮ್ಮ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿದಕ್ಕೂ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಇದನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರ ಭಾಷಣದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ, to facilitate discussion the Speaker can convert it.

ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ನಿಲವು ಏನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಆ ದಿನ ನಡೆದ ಘಟನೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ನಿಷ್ಕ್ರಿಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ತನಿಖೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ದಯಮಾಡಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ್ ಅರಸ್.—ತಾವು ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಮೋಷನ್ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನನ್ನ ಆಭ್ಯಂತರವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. I do not think anywhere the Police did not act. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ದೇವೇಗೌಡರು ಹಾಗೂ ಅವರ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತು ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡೋಣ. I am not unwilling for that. ಮತ್ತೆ ಈಗ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಐ.ಜಿ.ಪಿ.ಯವರು ಮುಂದಿನ ತಿಂಗಳು ಬರುವವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಸೇರಿದವರಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗೆ departmental action, in action ಈ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ರೆಫರ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ನಿಷ್ಕ್ರಿಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯಾಗಬೇಕು, In the history, there was no Police inaction in any State, there is excess action. But here, there is inaction and therefore a Judicial enquiry is necessary.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.— ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸೋಣ. ಮತ್ತೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರ ಭಾಷಣದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅನೇಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ರೂಪಿಸುವ ಕೋಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಆಗ ನಾನು ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಾಲ್ಪೀಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ನಾನು ನೀವೂ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ತಲೆಬಾಗಬೇಕಲ್ಲ. We will take up the next item on the agenda viz., "the motion of thanks to Governor's Address".

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.— Unless the Government agrees for the judicial enquiry, we will not allow the other items on the agenda to be taken up.

MR. SPEAKER.— Sri Harnahalli Ramaswamy may move the motion.

Motion of Thanks to the Governor's Address

ಶ್ರೀ ಹಾರನಹಳ್ಳಿ ರಾಮಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ಗಂಡಸಿ) — ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, “ದಿನಾಂಕ : ೧೮ನೇ ಜನವರಿ ೧೯೭೯ ರಂದು ವಿಧಾನ ಮಂಡಲದ ಸಂಯುಕ್ತಾಧಿವೇಶನವನ್ನು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಭಾಷಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರೆಲ್ಲರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಭಿನಂದಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.”

SRI M. C. NANAIAH (Madikere).— I second the motion.

Protests from Opposition Party Members and Gheroeing the Speaker

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.— ನಾವು ೨-೩ ಸಾರಿ ಈ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹಲವಾರು ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಅವರ ಮನವರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.— ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ೩ ದಿವಸವಾಯಿತು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.— ನಾವು ಕಳೆದ ಮೂರು ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಏತಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ತಾವು ಮರೆತುಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಾ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.— ತಾವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಸದಕಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ನಾವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಹೋಗೋಣ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.— ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾದಂತೆ ಈ ಸದನದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಶೋತ್ತರದ ಹೇಳಿ ಮುಗಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಮ್ಮ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ನಂತರ ಸಭಾ ನಾಯಕರಾದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದಾಯಿತು. ಆಮೇಲೆ ತಮಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವಲಂಬಿಸಿರುತ್ತದೆಂದು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.— ಸದಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಗೌರ್ಮ್ ಆಡ್ರೆಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಅಥವಾ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಿ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.— ನೀವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದದ್ದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.— There is no use in going back to the same point.

(At this stage all the members of the Opposition entered the aisle and stood up there. The House was in disorder)

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.— Sir, my suggestion is that the Leader of the Opposition and the other members of the Opposition, some of them, if not all, have come with a determination to obstruct the business of the House. I only request them.....

(No, No—a voice heard from the Opposition members)